

explain," which is not surprising. If he would drop the "Erbstock" hypothesis, this difficulty would disappear.

A similar shifting of the ground is evident in Dr. Plate's references to the symmetry relations, which he now regards as "details." In his book he regarded them as fundamental. But it seems that the very fact that a structure is caused by segregating genes makes it a "detail" in Dr. Plate's estimation.

The logical basis of Dr. Plate's assumption of "inhibitors" proved on analysis to be faulty. To judge from his letter he has not—if I may say so with the utmost politeness—grasped the meaning or importance of this criticism; for he makes no attempt to answer it. But actually the position is untenable in logic as well as in fact.

I fear that I cannot accept Dr. Plate's estimate of the function of a reviewer. The writer of a review is obliged to draw the reader's attention to points which invite criticism; but nobody can reasonably expect him to present "better explanations" for facts which do not exist! Nor is the "Erbstock" hypothesis the only one of Dr. Plate's speculations against which I "could say something of importance." Limitations of space make a fuller discussion impossible. I am content if I have said enough to prove that my criticisms were relevant and based on a sufficiently detailed knowledge of Dr. Plate's work.

H. G. HILL.

London, W.C.1.

*** This correspondence is closed.

Policy of the Society

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—May I add my voice in support of the first half of Mr. Wicksteed Armstrong's letter in your October 1936 issue (p. 245)? Never was there such an opportunity as now, when people are becoming interested in the population question, for stressing the eugenic aspect of it, and bringing pressure to bear on the nation and government to arrange taxation on eugenic lines. An able article by Mr. R. F. Harrod in the *Spectator* of January 15th puts the case for equalizing the burden of parentage very clearly, and in his bold demand for differential family allowances points clearly to one way of overcoming intentional limitation. It is surely not creditable to the executive of this *Society* that it should at this time apparently be doing nothing to further our founder's object and the purpose for which the *Society* has been entrusted with so much wealth, but should leave this to a general paper like the *Spectator*.

P. F. FYSON.

Rushwick,
Worcester.

*** This letter is referred to in "Notes of the Quarter."

"We Europeans"

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—In reply to Professor Gates's letter,* I wish to reaffirm that *We Europeans* is not and was never conceived as anything but a scientific work, and that I can see no justification for his assertion that it "contains whole chapters of tendentious statements."

JULIAN S. HUXLEY.

Zoological Society of London,
Regent's Park, London, N.W.8.

*** This correspondence is closed.

Population

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I beg to submit the following observations: (1) Dr. Kuczynski's exposition of the population trends is being made a political ramp by certain reformers, some of them going so far in their one-sided and alarmist articles in the newspapers as to suggest that only Socialism will bring back an adequate birth-rate. (2) They misleadingly stress the mounting proportion of old persons and say nothing about the other, and far more important, estimate that, at the worst, for at least a century the workers will outnumber the children and aged. (3) They say: "You who hold, wrongly, that falling numbers will mean rising prosperity and argue that this will bring back an adequate fertility should realize that it is just the richer people who are having the smallest families," ignoring that these may resume begetting adequate families when the poor cease to make this unfashionable by having large ones. (4) They say that a panic may develop and lead to the addition of a torrent of babies to the host of pensioners, ignoring that even imperialistic couples will not have offspring which they do not see their way to provide for. (5) My suggestion has been ignored—perhaps rightly—that when the Asiatics begin to reduce their very high birth-rate they will thereby start a prolonged boom in world trade. In any case, the idea that a declining population in England must cause a decline of its manufactures is surely questionable. (6) Even with a diminishing population the effort to get the lowest fertility in the poorest classes should go on. Professor J. B. S. Haldane, although a Left Wing geneticist, said recently (*Birmingham Post*, February 24th, 1937) that it was almost certainly not the case that all the differences between the social classes which were measured by the intelligence quotient of children were due to environment and added that a continuance of the present differential fertility might be expected to cause a very slow decline in the intelligence of the nation. (7) Professor Carr-Saunders most fortunately holds that voluntary parenthood must be the basis of a satisfactory population policy, and I

* EUGENICS REVIEW, 1937, XXVIII, 338.